



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,292	07/03/2001	Michele Amouyal	1231-01	2241

35811 7590 11/01/2004

IP DEPARTMENT OF PIPER RUDNICK LLP
ONE LIBERTY PLACE, SUITE 4900
1650 MARKET ST
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

CALAMITA, HEATHER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1637

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/898,292	AMOUYAL, MICHELE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Heather G. Calamita, Ph.D.	1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 11-14, 16-18, 20-23 and 28 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 11-14, 16-18, 20-23 and 28 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to amendment, the examiner acknowledges the claims are numbered in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126, and the rejection is withdrawn. The cancellation of claims 19 and 27 are acknowledged. The amendment to claim 11 and the addition of new claim 28 is acknowledged.

Claim Interpretation

2. Claim 11 is amended to include the limitation "wherein said DNA compaction agent is present at a concentration sufficient to allow flexibility of said DNA insert. This is read as any concentration that will permit the ligation reaction to occur. This could also read on specific concentrations necessary to permit unusual ligation reactions intended by applicant and not specified in the claim, therefore rejections are made under both 102 and 103.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 11-14, 16-18, 22, 23 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hodgson et al. (USPN 6,410,220 B1 06/25/2002).

Hodgson et al. teach (claims 11 and 28) a method for preparing circularized recombinant nucleic acids from a vector and an insert by ligating a DNA insert and a DNA vector in the presence of a DNA compaction agent selected from the group consisting of histone proteins, histone protein derivatives, viral envelope proteins, bacterial chromoid proteins, non-histone chromosomal proteins, HMGs derivatives of

said proteins, and mixtures of said proteins and protein derivatives and selecting said circularized recombinant nucleic acid (see whole document, especially col. 23 lines 17-27). With regard to claims 12 and 27, they teach the circularized recombinant nucleic acid as greater than 5 and 10 kb (see col. 23 lines 22-24). With regard to claim 13, they teach the selection steps of transferring the circularized recombinant nucleic acid into a cellular medium, cloning nucleic acid, and testing for the presence of the insert in the circularized recombinant nucleic acid (see col. 23 lines 22-27). With regard to claim 14, they teach the DNA compaction agent is selected from the group consisting of a protein, a mixture of proteins and protein derivatives exhibiting the properties of the DNA compaction agent (see col. 23 lines 49-51). With regard to claims 16, 17, 18, they teach adding a ligase to a ligation medium containing the DNA in solution in ligation buffer or adding the compaction agent to the ligation medium prior to the addition of ligase or adding the ligase and the compaction agent simultaneously (see col. 23 line 52). With regard to claim 22, they teach the ligation medium comprising a stabilizing agent that prevents denaturation, aggregation, and absorption of the DNA compaction agent (see col. 23 line 52). With regard to claim 23, they teach histone proteins (see col. 23 line 51).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hodgson et al. (USPN 6,410,220 B1 06/25/2002) in view of Nagaki et al. (BBRC 246:137-141, 1998).

The teachings of Hodgson et al. are described previously.

Hodgson et al. do not teach a specific amount of HMG to use in the ligation reaction.

Nagaki et al. do teach using a range of 0.5 μ g to 2.0 μ g of HMG in the ligation reaction (see whole document, especially Fig. 2, page 139).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to apply Nagaki's method of using a range of HMG concentrations with Hodgson's method of ligating insert and vector DNA in order to determine the amount of protein needed for the reaction. Nagaki et al. state that HMG1 and HMG2 stimulate cohesive-end and blunt-end ligations with DNA ligase (see col. 2 2nd paragraph pp 137-138). It would have been prima facie obvious to apply Nagaki's range of HMG concentrations with Hodgson's method for ligating insert and vector DNA to achieve the expected advantage of achieving optimal ligation activity with a given amount of DNA and HMG.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed June 30, 2004 have been fully considered and are not found persuasive.

Applicant argues Hodgson teaches adding a DNA condensing agent after ligation. With respect to this argument the examiner refers applicant to col. 23 lines 49-52, where Hodgson states, "Another method is to add a DNA condensing reagent (dendrimers, polycations [such as polyethyleneamine] histones or liposomes) directly to the DNA ligation reaction."

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant argues the instant invention is a DNA insert with enough flexibility to facilitate the construction of a large circularized recombinant nucleic acid molecules, and that Hodgson does not teach or suggest the use of a DNA compacting agent to provide flexibility.

Applicant argues the deficiencies of Hodgson, however, these deficiencies are addressed by Nagaki. Nagaki teaches using a condensing agent, specifically histone proteins, during the ligation reaction. Nagaki further teaches histone proteins bind DNA in a sequence-non-specific manner and **bend** the DNA (see p. 137 col. 2, paragraph 2 sentence 3). The bending of the DNA connotes flexibility.

Summary

6. No claims were allowed.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather G. Calamita, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571.272.2876 and whose e-mail address is heather.calamita@uspto.gov. However, the office cannot guarantee security through the e-mail system nor should official papers be transmitted through this route. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7:00 A.M. - 5:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 571.272.0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

hgc


JEFFREY FREDMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

10/29/04